

Boston University

Filshag, D Boston Univ. 3/2/83 (MB-GNotes)
Dept History, Faculty Seminar (4/21/83)
(+See Tape)

Current Risks of Arms Race as
Resulting from Deterrenting 2 Superpowers.

Hard to keep in focus that both US + USSR are
increasing human dangers. Not totally symmetric.

Nevertheless: Try to understand current situation in effort
to resist it. (as in being compared to current
preparations)

"Crime" of Soviet Union - (eg Stalin) - loss of
Life in Collectivization - Purges of 40's - (as R
Pipes is always long) Compare Stalin's massacres to
current preparations for much of half a billion.

Neither US nor USSR went this war - "It's a
moral and legal matter: to be turned on ^{under} certain
circumstances (aside from accident) ^{deliberately} ^{which}
Crime of Stalin's compares to these preparations for
genocide (1st or 2nd) This outwits Stalin's crimes.

(USA) We don't feel this way in US - as it is a
minor crime (Do not select for indictment
a crime that you are equally guilty of) -

Up to Khrushchev - no "prudent arms race"
USSR only

After 1961, when SU had 4 ICBMs, US had
When people say "Deterrence has worked for 30 years -
All assume there was parity all along (Mutual Assured Destruction)
US had monopoly until Brezhnev said - Gorbachev
to his JCS -

2

In late 60's USSR began spending & US had spent earlier (esp. pouring concrete around silos)

Parity - 1968 (9) ^{Reached by USSR} but USA continued to

race - USA (1983) technologically ahead.

USSR were "catching up" until 1968-9
(1st-use threats by USA were credible until late 60's
thus "deterrence" made more sense then)

1958 - Taiwan Straits Crisis (When U.S. & Chinese warships
closed) & PRC had raided Taiwan, Eisenhower
had authorized JCS for (ultimately) all-out strike
on PRC. (See H. Halperin) PRC ~~lobbed~~ down
& USSR withdraw nuclear threats. By 1960, split complete between
PRC & USSR. Krushchev's "bluff" (We are producing much
weapons like sausages) In 1962 - USSR had 10
operational missiles (4 ICBMs).

In second period, thus - USSR was only
"catching up"

Now (1983) Soviets are full active participants
in the arms race. - Numbers not Central now
but kinds of weapons are. Dangers lie in that
both sides are doing it. Now a new time = both
have vulnerable forces. (Each can decide if they
hit strikes first) US had monopoly until 1963 for 20 years

Re
CHINA

3)

1st period was stable - (US monopoly)

Period now is what people thought was happening in 1950's

"Counterforce" thinking is not now - (Doesn't exist around 1958-1963) We thought in 1958-T, was what, it now is, in fact. (Large missiles compensate for ^{multiple} inaccuracy)
In early 1970's (M117) increased yield & weight ratio.

On every year - US doctrine has been to initiate an attack (No-strike not in our history)

Risks of a ~~first~~ truly surprise attack have been rejected by all presidents.

Wiesberg is not "preventive war" only (We do have, "use 'em or lose 'em")

W-will not subscribe to "No-first-use" doctrine.

Many present "strategic" generals will say there are

* "orders of catastrophe" + if an attack is incoming, will prefer to go first, not second.

US &

USSR } Current weaponry are 1st-use weapons

(to be used in a preemptive strike)

(in contrast to 10 years ago)

4

Must assume USSR are blindly imitating USA
or must assume they don't want to be caught
by surprise (as in on Pearl Harbor or their
attack by Hitler)

When USSR increases accuracy of SS-18 - doesn't
mean anything except for "Counterforce" power -

Anachronistic aspect of all this - (On both sides)
(USSR less committed to this role than USA)

Re Small-scale attacks:

Reagan's incentives (motives): (that could be
enriched by an democratic process) To induce big
public pressure on Reagan's cutbacks. Present scenario
is to come down (for a hole-in-one) at 1 or miles!

Within next 3 years, a freeze may be inattainable
Must stop Pershing, MX-103 by immediately ((have
a movement now higher than V-Kin Wa time)) must
try to stop it right now - (USSR are developing
SS-23's which is like Pershing) USSR threatens
to bring into E. Germany -

I don't trust the USSR not to do competitive
risk-taking (any more than USA).

Q: Why is USSR less committed to that role?

A: Officials from country (oil executives etc) &

No tape found to
check this w/ Q.